DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 578 EA 012 376

AUTHOR Gilbert, Michael E., Ed.
TITLE Change in School Administration. Monograph No. 4.
INSTITUTION University of the Pacific, Stockton, Calif.
PUB DATE Jan 80
NOTE 48p.: Prepared by the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Change Strategies; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; Models; *Peer Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation; *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

This monograph, dealing with some current issues in educational administration, points out some of the dilemmas and problems that accompany the educational changes that administrators face. The papers included in the publication outline important challenges with which educational leaders must cope, such as changing public policy and concomitant responses that school districts may make in compliance efforts. Four papers are included: "The Rapidly Changing Administrative Scene," exploring why the job of administrator has become less rewarding; "The Current State of Teacher Tenure," presenting the changing view of teacher tenure, including information about when tenured teachers may be terminated and given lateral reassignments; "Peer Consultation: Procedures and Problems," outlining changing practices in teacher evaluation; and "A Change Model for Schools," focusing on the change process. (Author/JM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED181578

# CHANGE IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Monograph No. 4
Bureau of Educational Research
and Field Services
University of the Pacific
Stockton, California 95211

Michael B. Gilbert
Editor

January, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Gilbert

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



EA 012 376

Copies of this monograph may be obtained for $3.00 prepaid from:

Director
Bureau of Educational Research
and Field Services
University of the Pacific
Stockton, California 95211

# PROLOGUE

This monograph, which deals with some current issues in educational administration, vividly points out some of the dilemmas and problems about change which administrators face. The papers, included in this publication, outline important challenges with which educational leaders must cope such as changing public policy and concomitant responses that school districts may make in compliance efforts.

Klapstein's paper, "The Rapidly Changing Administrative Scene," clearly shows the change in public attitude which translates into revised public policy. His paper alludes to the negative effect that Proposition 13 has had on all levels of education in California. In analyzing the reasons why the proposition passed, he suggests that many citizens have lost faith in government and those who hold leadership positions.

In his article, Klapstein indicates that many educational leaders do not enjoy the respect that their predecessors in office did. He suggests increased intrusion of some boards of education into administrative realms rather than remaining in their rightful policy making roles. He indicates that administrative salaries, in many instances, provide little incentive and encouragement for articulate and young aspiring leaders.

Klapstein closes his paper with a clarion call to do something about the rewards system for future educational leaders. He suggests that present practices likely will not motivate the most able potential leaders into public education. If one were to accept his thesis and extrapolate forward for a generation or

two, he would be hard pressed to disagree with Klapstein's contention that future leaders may be less able and the resulting consequences would be detrimental to the profession and to the public welfare.

"The Current State of Teacher Tenure," a paper written by Gilbert, attests to another area in which change is affecting education. Whereas tenure laws were never intended to provide an unconditional guarantee of employment for the tenured, Gilbert reviews the fact that they were designed to protect an employee against termination without sufficient grounds for dismissal. He outlines the longstanding reasons whereby tenured teachers can be terminated, e.g., insubordination, malfeasance, and immorality. He properly indicates that currently, however, fewer children exist to be educated. As a result of changing public policy to cope with this phenomenon, he outlines the conditions under which even tenured teachers may be terminated, normally on the basis of seniority, when programs are deleted or curtailed as a result of significantly reduced ADA.

Gilbert's discussion of lateral reassignments of tenured teachers is sage advice. While he indicates that lateral reassignments are possible for tenured teachers, he cautions against those which obviously constitute demotion. One is led to conclude from studying Gilbert's paper that a teacher who acquires tenure should be given every chance to improve performance and effectiveness, perhaps through peer consultation as suggested in Reimer's paper which follows.

An understanding of change theory, creative leadership, and

faculty commitment are requisite to successful and systematic change processes according to Reimer's paper, "Peer Consultation: Procedures and Problems.' In his paper, Reimer refers to the change that is taking place in evaluating teacher instructional effectiveness. He indicates that a site administrator still has the responsibilities for implementing the processes of evaluation to determine the value of the individual teacher to the educational system.

His provocative article traces the movement away from unilateral assessment of teacher effectiveness by the principal to two other basic modes: 1) peer evaluation, and 2) peer consultation. In treating these two modes of evaluation, he implies that the former is more or less a misnomer, i.e., under peer evaluation the individual teacher is not usually evaluated for termination, dismissal, deselection, or firing; rather for instructional improvement. Viewed from this perspective, peer consultation seems to be a better mode for assessing instructional improvement for all teachers.

Reimer accurately asserts that adequate resources to train teachers as peer consultants and to employ substitutes to enable them to engage in observation and demonstration teaching are crucial if peer consultation is to become a viable process for educational improvement, i.e., improved teacher effectiveness. Through the medium of micro-teaching, for example, teachers can improve their instructional effectiveness as they critique their teaching behavior through peer consultation.

The Reimer paper concludes on an optimistic note by positing the principal in a leadership role retaining responsibility for

evaluation of teacher effectiveness, while receiving evaluation reports through the medium of peer consultation. He reviews such reports and uses data from them in reporting personnel evaluations to the central office.

The concluding paper of this monograph, "A Change Model for Schools," was written by Coleman. In it, he rightly states that change will take place in one of two ways: 1) by design, or 2) by default. No able leader would expect salutary outcomes to accrue from the latter process. Rather, by assuming a proactive stance, an effective leader would manage change by design.

Coleman suggests twelve proven steps in a designed plan for implementing change. In summary, these steps involve: 1) creating a milieu conducive for change, 2) identifving needs, 3) developing a systematic plan for achieving objectives, 4) marshalling human, physical, and fiscal resources, 5) assessing outcomes, 6) revising and institutionalizing, and 7) restoring homeostasis and providing for monitoring. He concludes his paper with a proper caveat that change will be most effective in an open environment. Since change is inevitable, an administrator will be well-advised to orchestrate change according to the model suggested by Coleman.

In summary, the four papers presented in this monograph are addressed to change. In turn, key issues were treated involving: 1) administrative changes, 2) a changing view of tenure occasioned by decreasing enrollments, 3) changed practices in teacher evaluation, and 4) change process. The Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services has published this monograph

in the hope that the information included on current change in educational leadership will be helpful to administrators, teachers, and school board members.

Oscar T. Jarvis
Dean
School of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| PROLOGUE<br>Oscar T. Jarvis | i |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | vi |
| THE RAPIDLY CHANGING ADMINISTRATIVE SCENE<br>Earl L. Klapstein | 1 |
| THE CURRENT STATE OF TEACHER TENURE<br>Michael B. Gilbert | 9 |
| PEER CONSULTATION: PROCEDURES AND PROBLEMS<br>Roger L. Reimer | 20 |
| A CHANGE MODEL FOR SCHOOLS<br>Thomas C. Coleman | 30 |

# THE RAPIDLY CHANGING ADMINISTRATIVE SCENE*

Earl L. Klapstein

The title of my lecture today, "The Rapidly Changing Administrative Scene," is probably as much a statement about American social conditions as it is a topic limited to current management trends in education. None of us naïvely believes the halls of learning are insulated from the social, economic and political winds of the "real world". So, when discussing changes in the educational administrative scene, I must --and want to-- tie those changes in with what is taking place simultaneously on the American scene. I raise this point at the outset because I firmly believe this is a clear case of the tail wagging the dog. As educators, we must be vigilant to changing social trends affecting our institutions and, to some degree, our careers as well.

The best current example of this phenomenon is California's Proposition 13. I don't want to dwell on Proposition 13 because that's a topic in itself. However, it does serve as a good example of how a public issue, separate from education, can have a dramatic --and even traumatic --effect on public education and professionals.

---

*This is the transcript of the William Harris Lecture given at the University of the Pacific Honors and Recognition Day, April 29, 1979. Dr. Klapstein is Chancellor of the Los Rios Community College District in Sacramento, California.

My wife, I'm sure, is both amazed and relieved that I'm able to function today, almost a year after Howard Jarvis and Paul Gann became symbols for California's not-so-silent majority. These gentlemen caused me and hundreds of others in jobs like mine one giant headache. I feel somewhat like a woman who's just completed a 12-month pregnancy. Very tired, very glad the roughest part is over and very determined not to go through all <u>that</u> again.

The administrative picture in education, however, began changing long before Howard Jarvis made the cover of <u>TIME</u> magazine, just as did the general picture we all live with here in America. Some contemporary thinkers have said this country turned sour on November 22, 1963, in Dallas, Texas, and has yet to recover. Certainly, the turmoil of the 60s and early 70s left us with an apathy and skepticism that has impacted all our major institutions--government, business, labor and public and private education.

For example, a 1976 poll by the Public Agenda Foundation found that trust in the government dropped from 76 percent in 1964 to 33 percent twelve years later. That same poll found that 83 percent of the American public did not trust those in leadership positions as much as they once did.

How much did the Kennedy, Vietnam and Watergate tragedies contribute to this decline? -- I'll leave this to the social scientists and pollster like Lou Harris to decide-- However, I suspect they are only part of a ubiquitous shift in the relationship society now shared with those in leadership positions.

I'll also shy away from another related message entitled: "If feelings about leaders have changed, what are the manifestations?" Instead, I will remain on course and address the question of what this change means to current and future education leaders.

Before I do though, I think it wise we first establish what the present state of the art in higher education management is. On one hand, management has moved away gradually from past practices of autocratic rule toward a consultative mode. The feeling today is that no one woman, man or group has the corner on truth or wisdom in this multi-faceted world of ours.

I like to believe I was ahead of my time, as a new college president 18 years ago in the State of Washington, when I initiated a team management system instead of the old authoritarian approach. The team style I used then, however, didn't become an accepted American management model until about five to ten years later when management schools gave a Big Business Blessing to the idea that a profit can be realized even in the you-look-out-for-me and I'll-look-out-for-you bureaucratic setting of government and education.

While more and more educational leaders have taken to mutual assistance, they are also being required as individuals to deal with more issues and "publics" than ever before. One higher education journal last year devoted an entire issue to the various roles and functions of a college president-- the college president as a manager, as a marketer, as a facilitator, as a finance officer, as an education leader and as a politician.

This, of course, only covers part of the waterfront.

Education leaders today must also be concerned with union employee relations, student affairs, community and media needs, board contacts, state and federal regulations, affirmative action, and not last or least, the aspirations of that particular administrator's secretary - - you must walk a tightrope today. If you don't know how to do it before you get up there, you may be in for a fall or two.

And, if your ego trip causes you to think you can also walk on water, you'd better know where the river's stepping stones are located. If you don't, you may find yourself in deep water. Only a large degree of humility and humor can save you today.

I suppose at this point custom would require I describe education management as "tough but satisfying work". But custom is based on past thinking. It is not necessarily reflective of current practice.

Nearly 25 years ago I started to pursue my career in educational management. At that time it was indelibly planted in my psyche that authority deserves respect. I also felt that hard and honest work begets personal satisfaction and professional rewards. Five people who put those "old fashioned" thoughts in my head were my parents and the late Amos Alonzo Stagg, Marc Jantzen, and Tully C. Knoles, one of Pacific's great university presidents. But the circumstances that made those kinds of beliefs common thinking 25 years ago have somehow changed.

Richard Richardson, a former college president who now teaches at Arizona State University, recently wrote in the American Community and Junior College Journal: "Gone forever are the good old days when the president was widely recognized and even admired. Now he is more frequently the embattled target of pressure groups whose single interests are so diverse that whatever decision he makes generates more detractors than supporters."

Luvern Cunningham, a prominent educator writing in Education Digest, took that same thought a step further when, after reviewing today's leadership environment concluded, "It is understandable that many will capitulate in the face of such odds, throw in the towel, ride out the event until retirement and then walk away disappointed." The reason for this disappointment among many of my peers relates to what the changing administrative scene I'm talking about is rapidly changing into -- Some examples I think can help make the point.

I've already touched on the loss of respect for people in positions of responsibility. It seems more than ever, that administrators in public education are viewed by many groups almost as Martian-like creatures, people to be approached with caution. The ego reward for the job now comes mainly from understanding peers -- There are other examples.

Administrative salaries that once provided both an incentive and reward for the responsibility of managing a college department or division are now only slightly better than those of

senior faculty members and, indeed, are no higher in many cases if broken down by the number of hours and days spent on the job. In the past years, the fringe benefit of having the time necessary to write, to articulate educational philosophy and to contemplate future directions of learning as they apply to future student and institutional needs was an important part of an administrator's professional life. But time and priorities often forbid introspection when problems of declining finances and enrollment, collective bargaining and politics require survival first and personal development second -- These are, of course, but a few of the circumstances that the education manager of today faces.

I've purposely saved my final example for last because in public education, it is the most important. And that is, the ominous sign of deterioration in the relationship between college administrators and their bosses, the college board of trustees.

Administrators for years have been sniped at to varying degrees from below and outside. Fortunately, a well developed and regularly tested underbelly of thick skin prevents most of those shots from penetrating too deeply.

But the recent phenomenon I see occurring across the nation of boards jumping on the whip-the-president or superintendent's bandwagon for political reasons should be of concern to both the educator whose career may face this dilemma some day and to those who profess interest in improving our educational system.

The pattern of board and executive officer deterioration has become so commonplace that it now appears regularly in the literature. Dr. David Sims, the new chancellor at Marin College District, recently wrote an article giving tips for those trying to find a chief executive's job. In it, he listed several questions any candidate should ask and answer before taking a job. Among them: Does the board have a history of meddling in administrative affairs? and, Is there an entrenched pattern of split votes?

It's no secret that I work for a very political and, at times, controversial district. The average job expectancy of a Los Rios chancellor is about three and a half years. In completing my third year in Sacramento, I understand why those guys who stayed less than the average got out when they did and I wonder how the guy that stayed five years made it. I don't want to go into many of those "interesting" Los Rios details because this will be part of my book -- but I must say that when issues unrelated to education begin impacting a system to an unhealthy degree, the losers are going to be the administrators, the staff, the students and the public.

It doesn't take much insight to recognize a dangerous trend unfolding if this changing board/administrative scene is allowed to proceed to its worst-case conclusion -- <u>The scenario I foresee for that goes something like this</u>. The rewards to those in management positions become negligible. The money is only slightly better and too much of it is for combat pay. The hours and pressures are tough. Much of the faculty and public

now view administrators as "necessary evils" rather than as education and community leaders. And the governing board on a regular basis takes out licenses to shoot doen publicly a chief executive or leadership staff.

If this trend continues, I'm convinced we'll see the talented leaders of tomorrow write administrative careers off as "unnecessary hassles" and take their talents elsewhere. I'm not saying there won't always be people ready to fill those positions. What I am saying, though, is that the potential drain of top-notch talent threatens to downgrade the quality of the applicant pool. Extrapolate this out a generation and soon you'd find those vying for the top jobs less talented overall than those that preceeded them. This possibility alone should send up warning flares throughout the system and for schools of education and management. The consequences of losing talented educators to other pursuits and leaving the business -- our business --of educational leadership to less than the best would, in the long run, be devastating to education and to our nation.

There are things which can and must be done in the near future to slow up and reverse this trend. Dean Jarvis, I feel quality schools of education such as yours may have a major role to play in this matter. Pacific never surprises me when it plays some important role. It always has. It always will.

I thank you for the honor you have given me by permitting me to be your William Harris Lecturer today. I wish you well.

# THE CURRENT STATE OF TEACHER TENURE

Michael B. Gilbert*

Will teacher tenure as it is currently constituted become ephemeral? Moreover, are the protections offered by California's teacher tenure law still necessary? These questions and others regarding the provisions of permanent employment for public school teachers are becoming more and more germane with the advent of school tax revisions and declining enrollments.

Teacher tenure in California was legitimized by the legislature more than 50 years ago. The intent, as with other tenure laws, was to offer job security to certificated personnel. Teacher tenure was not then, nor is it now, an unconditional guarantee of employment. It protects the employee against termination where there are no substantial grounds for dismissal. Furthermore, the courts have ruled that there is no vested right to public employment as long as the termination of a contract is not in violation of the exercise of one's constitutional rights.

Tenured teachers may be terminated, but the procedures for such termination are specified in statute and are explicit. Perhaps, some of the reasons that more tenured teachers are not fired are the time-consuming procedures that must be followed,

---

*Dr. Gilbert is director of the Bureau of Educational Research and Field Services at the University of the Pacific.

the potential ill will and low morale caused, and the reluctance of administrators, supervisors and school boards to be cast in the role of the "bad guy," regardless of how legitimate, or even mandatory, the termination is. So what can be observed is the "Lateral Arabesque" of the Peter Principle, moving staff to less sensitive positions, or making job assignments so unpalatable that the employee in question moves on to other things.

## The Concept of Tenure

Forty states currently have full or partial teacher tenure laws on record. However, the question as to their necessity is beginning to arise.[1] The concerns of most tenure laws are (1) the personnel to be granted tenure, (2) the area of the state to be covered, (3) the probationary periods, (4) the causes for dismissal, and (5) the procedural process for dismissal.[2] Basically, the objectives of tenure are:

1. To guarantee personal security,
2. To protect employees from unwarranted dismissal,
3. To encourage academic freedom in the classroom.
4. To protect the incompetent from gaining permanent employment,
5. To maintain staff stability and to promote job satisfaction,
6. To ensure personal freedom outside the classroom,
7. To assure the community that well-qualified people are employed.[3]

---

[1]J. Leo Freiwald, "Tenure: Another Sacred Cow about to Bite the Dust? Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 1 (September, 1979), p. 50.

[2]Edwin D. Coyle, "Legal Cause and Procedure in the Dismissal of Tenured Teachers" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1975).

[3]Ibid.

In 1926 the National Education Association stated a rationale for tenure:

1. Indefinite or permanent tenure tends to decrease teacher turnover and stabilizes the profession.
2. Tenure protects the great body of good teachers from political attacks and from dismissal for petty personal and political reasons. It is in accordance with the American principle of civil service and against a political spoils system in the schools.
3. A sound tenure law provides for the easy dismissal of incompetent or insubordinate teachers when just cause can be shown.
4. It encourages professional growth and a higher professional standard for all teachers.
5. It tends to attract to the profession able and competent young persons because of increased stability of the profession and better opportunities for a career in teaching.[4]

The state of personal and professional protection was such that in 1926 the NEA rationale was highly appropriate. Today, with the passage of many education and civil liberties laws, many of those conditions have changed. It is very difficult for boards of education and administrators to be arbitrary, whimsical and capricious in dealing with school employees. The federal and state courts have provided guiding principles governing the constitutional rights of teachers. Before a teacher can be dismissed . .

1. It must be demonstrated that a teacher's personal conduct adversely affects his/her performance in the classroom.
2. It must be demonstrated that a teacher's behavior disrupts the effectiveness of the school's program.
3. It must be demonstrated that a teacher's action interferes with the school's internal and external relationships.
4. It must be demonstrated that a teacher's action substantially threatens the state's interests.[5]

---

[4]Ibid. [5]Ibid.

Previously discussed have been the concerns, objectives, rationale, and judicial principles to guide the exercise of tenure. But what is tenure specifically? The following features appear in tenure laws:

* Completion of a specified probationary period, construed to mean a temporary appointment during which time the individual is carefully supervised and appraised in terms of his ability to render efficient service to the school organization.
* Automatic tenure status at the end of the probationary period to personnel who meet performance standards.
* An orderly procedure for the dismissal of personnel. This includes provision for notifying the individual that his services are unsatisfactory, as well as a reasonable opportunity to show improvement before notice of intent to dismiss is given.
* Notice of intent to terminate the services of an individual in the event that the desired improvement in performance has not been attained. Written notice of the intent to dismiss details the specific reasons for the contemplated action.
* A hearing before local school authorities which provides opportunity for the affected staff member to defend himself against the charges.
* The right to appeal an adverse decision to higher educational authority and to the courts.[6]

One can see readily that the precepts of the due process appear here. Hence, in most instances, the specifics of tenure laws have been subsumed under the Fourteenth Amendment. Teacher tenure laws "are aimed at protecting the individual against unjust treatment from the forces of society to which he is subject."[7] Again, it may be seen that the rights of the individual are important; tenure laws seem to restate those rights.

---

[6]William B. Castetter, The Personnel Function in Educational Administration (2nd ed.; New York: Macmillan, 1976), p. 422.

[7]Cecil Winfield Scott, Indefinite Teacher Tenure (New York: Columbia University Press, 1934), p. 1.

Tenure in California

In California employees in public school districts with an average daily attendance of 250 pupils or more after being employed for three years and re-elected for the next year to a position requiring certification qualifications will become permanent employees of the district at the close of the succeeding year.[8] It should be recognized that teacher tenure is statutory and not contractual;[9] that is, teacher tenure is not a constitutionally vested right but lies within the plenary power of the legislature.[10] This all means that the tenure provisions of school law do not become part of a teacher's contract of employment, but rather are restrictions upon the power of a school district to dismiss a teacher after he/she has been employed under specified conditions for a certain length of time.[11] The purpose of providing for a teacher's permanent status upon election after employment for three consecutive school years is to give security in employment and to prevent dismissal of a teacher without cause, and not to give a vested interest in certain classes, certain hours or a certain salary.[12]

---

[8] California, Education Code, Sec. 13304 (1975).

[9] Taylor v. Board of Education of the City of San Diego, 89 p. 2d 148; 31 C.A. 2d 734 (1939).

[10] Kast v. Board of Trustees of American River Junior College District, 34 Cal. Rptr. 710; 222 C.A. 2d 8 (1963).

[11] Taylor, op. cit.

[12] Mitchell v. Board of Trustees of Visalia Union High School District, 42 p. 2d 397; 5 C.A. 2d 64 (1935).

The issues of teacher tenure are ones of employment status and dismissal procedures. In the absence of reasonable cause, the provisions of the tenure law protect a teacher who has undergone successfully a probationary period from unwarranted and unjustified dismissal. Tenure does not mean that a teacher, having attained that status, can never be terminated. Moreover, a change in job assignment does not change the status of a teacher's tenure.

> A permanent employee when advanced from a teaching position to an administrative or supervisory position, or assigned any special or other type of work, or given special classification or designation requiring certification qualifications, shall retain his permanent classification as a classroom teacher.[13]

California law allows for the dismissal of tenured teachers only for one or more of the following causes:

* Immoral or unprofessional conduct,
* Advocating overthrow of the government or being a member of an organization advocating such overthrow,
* Incompetency,
* Evident unfitness for service,
* Insubordination
* Willful violation of rules and regulations,[14] or
* Any good and just cause.[15]

These grounds for the dismissal of tenured teachers are designed to ensure the continued employment of competent and exemplary personnel. That is, one whose behavior indicates a negative example for the pupils he/she would teach can be dismissed.

---

[13] California, Education Code, Sec. 13314 (1975).

[14] Ibid., Sec. 13403 (1975).

[15] Ibid., Sec. 13403.5 (1975).

The procedures for the dismissal of tenured teachers are well specified in statute.[16]

1. A 30-day written notice is required specifying the acts or behavior which the teacher is alleged to have committed; however, this notice may not be given between May 15 and September 15.
2. The charged employee is entitled to a hearing at which he/she is entitled to be represented by counsel, to present evidence, to cross-examine testimony, to have a record of the proceedings, and to appeal an adverse decision.
3. The burden of proof lies with the board of education; a decision must be based only on the evidence presented at the hearing.
4. Boards are cautioned that a heavy reliance on hearsay testimony will most likely be inadmissible should a judicial proceeding arise.
5. Because of the unique organization of public school districts, the board may act as prosecutor, judge, and jury; however, this bias may provide a basis for appeal.
6. While not required, formal rules of evidence provide an adequate guide for the presentation of testimony.
7. Board decisions must be enacted in open meetings and members must be present to vote; however, the sensitive nature of the dismissal proceedings might be conducted in executive session.
8. Judicial remedy by the employee and the board is appropriate for appeal; however, the State Board of Education can also provide an appeal tribunal.

Before dismissal is attempted, administrators have certain other alternatives which they might pursue. In cases outside of felony convictions for moral turpitude or sexual misconduct, employees should be given opportunities to improve or remedy the situation. Evaluation of unsatisfacoty performance should be made by more than one person and the criteria for evaluation should be well specified and understood. A rule of thumb is that the measurement of performance should be gauged

---

[16] Ibid., Sec. 13404 ff. (1975).

by the average (hence, adequate) rather than the superior or outstanding criterion. Sufficient documentation should be kept of all proceedings with copies available to the teacher.

In essence, all should be done to assist the teacher in improving, where possible. If the teacher has performed adequately enough to gain tenure, serious breaches of performance or behavior should be the only reasons to consider termination. An employee can not be transformed magically (or whimsically) from a valued and competent staff member one year into an undersirable person the next. One clue here is to evaluate carefully and prudently probationary employees before they attain tenure. Perhaps, the need to terminate any employee can lie in the thoroughness of the initial employment process.

Aside from the reasons listed above, there is a practical fiscal aspect for the dismissal of tenured teachers. If the average daily attendance for the first six months of one school year falls below the same period for the previous two years, or whenever a particular kind of service is to be reduced or discontinued not later than the beginning of the following school year, the number of permanent employees in a school district may be reduced.[17] Seniority, as well as the other statutory provisions already cited, is the watchword. Qualifications for employment in a particular job must also guide decisions in these cases; e.g., certification to teach bilingual education may override seniority.

---

[17]Ibid., Sec. 13447 (1975).

There are some states which have no tenure law, but whose public school employees are protected nevertheless. For example, Georgia has a Professional Practices Commission, which operates independently of the State Superintendent of Schools. This commission acts to fact-find or arbitrate employee-employer practices which go beyond the local level. The key here is again due process and districts must conform to the stipulations of procedural due process. Thus, both employee and, in some cases, employer are protected. Employees are guaranteed that their constitutional rights will not be abridged and employers are guaranteed that they may continue to employ only competent personnel.

## The Future of Tenure

When boards of education and administrators were widely paternalistic and more autocratic than not, the need to protect the security and academic freedom of teachers was indicated strongly. It was felt that teachers should be guided and overseen almost as much as the pupils they taught. They could not let anything interfere with their jobs -- not marriage, "inappropriate" social behavior, or ideas radically different from the standards of the community. Moreover, former qualifications for teaching were little more than the rough equivalent of a high school education and the desire to teach. The adage -- "Anyone who can, does; anyone who can't, teaches" -- was not too far from being mildly accurate.

Today, the preparation for teaching is as vigorous as other professions. At least five years of training is required in most places, with a heavy emphasis on practical or internship experiences. Techniques and subject matter have become more complex and refined and are updated periodically to suggest the need for continual upgrading of skills.

In addition to the subject matter and processes of education, civil rights/liberties laws, and court decisions have forced education employers and supervisors to look at and treat their employees differently. The ironic twist to all the legislation and litigation that have evolved is that the exercise common sense and courtesy might have prevented the need for tenure laws.

Aside from the increasingly more sophisticated and qualified persons emerging from institutions of higher education as teachers, the employment picture is changing as well. For all intents public education is in a state of no growth on a national level. Some areas are experiencing rapid decline; fewer areas are burgeoning. The net result is that fewer teachers are needed. The eventual outcome is that intense competition is becoming more prevalent for teaching vacancies. This means that the incompetent and insubordinate will have no place in education because of the pool of highly qualified people ready to replace them. Moreover, policing the quality of the profession and the professionals will more than likely come from within as well as from outside the ranks of the teachers.

The protections offered by tenure laws will continue to exist but their necessity will be lessened because of other checks and balances emerging from teacher organizations. In fact, the tables may have turned in that good teachers will be in great demand; school districts may find it a challenge to retain superior professionals.

# PEER ~~EVALUATION~~ CONSULTATION: PROCEDURES AND PROBLEMS

Roger L. Reimer*

The pressures for change on all elements of the public school system are increasing rapidly, both in diversity and intensity. Two of these sources of pressure, collective negotiations and the call for accountability, have resulted in a greater emphasis on program and personnel evaluation. Of these two areas, the evaluation of personnel has become a matter of particular concern. The demands for improvement in the evaluation of school personnel and the subsequent response by members of the educational sector have resulted in a concept of "peer evaluation." The purpose of this paper is to explore this concept to clarify the educational jargon, and to offer an alternative to the dilemma created by the peer evaluation process.

Collective negotiations, which often put administrator and teacher in an adversary position, frequently result in teacher association proposals for "peer evaluation." Only in this way, so the association rationale goes, can the profession "police its own ranks," or as Elliott said can "... teachers ... take a firm hand in the guiding of their own professional development."[1]

---

*Dr. Reimer is Associate Professor of Educational Administration at the University of the Pacific.

[1]V. L. Elliott, "Peer Evaluation for Teachers? Why Not?" Elementary English, 10 (1974), 727.

Unfortunately, administrators are sometimes too eager to avoid the time consuming and often unrewarding task of teacher evaluation and, as a result, completely relinquish the responsibility without considering all of the ramifications. Beyond the legal aspects and the ethical commitment administrators may have to participate in faculty evaluation, Lieberman suggested that "... a basic purpose of the teacher organization is to protect teachers from unfair or incompetent evaluation. If other members of the bargaining unit conduct the evaluations, the organization is likely to support the teacher with the most organizational influence".[2] In any event, the evaluation policies which currently exist in any district should be considered very carefully before they are assigned to "give-away" status in the negotiations process.

As previously noted, the second source which provides momentum to the "peer evaluation movement" originates in the demand for accountability. These demands from the external and sometimes the internal sectors of the school community reverberate through school halls coming to rest at the classroom door. The first step in having better schools, say the advocates of accountability, is the assessment of the teachers' contribution to the educational process. The key term is evaluation--evaluation of the teacher training program, of the teacher's classroom behavior, and finally, of the changes in student behavior which may have resulted because of his

---

[2]M. Lieberman, "Should Teachers Evaluate Other Teachers?" School Management, 16 (1974), 4.

or her exposure to the classroom. Some of the educators (and would-be evaluators) believe it is the teacher training institutions who are at fault and would like to establish their own training process within their districts.[3] Others, perhaps more enlightened, suggest that evaluation of the educational establishment should revolve around teacher behavior in the classroom in combination with student growth.[4] The espousers of peer evaluation, now faced with increased demands for accountability throughout the educational system, suggest that teachers alone should be responsible for judging the value of a colleague's contribution.[5]

The implication of the rhetoric which flows from either master contracts or from the advocates of accountability is that new procedures which reserve the evaluation responsibility to peer groups will remedy the major ills of the educational system. It may be, however, that the arguments presented by these special interest groups do not represent what is best for the larger society.[6]

---

[3]R. R. Spillane and D. Levenson, "Teacher Training: A Question of Control, Not Content," Phi Delta Kappan, 57 (1976), 435.

[4]J. R. Jenkins and R. B. Bausell, "How Teachers View the Effective Teacher: Student Learning Is Not the Top Criterion," Phi Delta Kappan, 55 (1974), 572.

[5]R. A. Engel, "Teacher Evaluates Teacher for Pay Differentials," Clearing House, 45 (1971), 407.

[6]H. B. Scribner and L. B. Stevens, "The Politics of Teacher Competence," Phi Delta Kappan, 56 (1974), 51.

Within this framework, it seems appropriate to examine the terminology being used in relationship to personnel evaluation. Worthen and Sanders, although writing about program evaluation, have a statement which seems especially appropriate to this discussion. They stated: "Some readers may think that entirely too much fuss is being made over defining 'evaluation.' We cannot help being concerned with the meanings of words and, more importantly, with how they influence action."[7] A similar problem exists in most discussions of peer evaluation. In some instances evaluation is defined as a means through which people improve themselves and grow professionally. A second definition, usually presented in the same context, is more negative. An example is a statement by Link who said: "The question involved is whether we, in democracy, want a type of authoritarian evaluation which guides individuals into unquestioning obedience and submissiveness to persons superior in status."[8] He suggested that it is only through peer evaluation that teachers can avoid the oppression in which they find themselves. Seldom do presentations supporting peer evaluation address the issue of teacher "termination," "dismissal," "deselection," or "firing." The emphasis of evaluation must be on developing the potential of teachers to the fullest extent possible, not on "weeding out"

---

[7]B. R. Worthen and J. R. Sanders, Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones, 1973), p. 17.

[8]F. R. Link, "Merit Rating: Have the Issues Changed?" Supervision: Emerging Profession, ed. R. R. Leeper (Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, N.E.A., 1969), pp. 86-91

those who may be undesirable. Some confusion clearly exists when we use "staff development" and "evaluation" as synonymons terms. Indeed, the intent of the former, which may include observations and critiques by colleagues, is to promote improvement. Implementing this process, however, does not eliminate the need for the latter, i.e., to ascertain the value of or to determine the contribution of an individual teacher to the educational system. Someone must make these difficult decisions; it is not the responsibility of a group, a colleague or a combination of the two. The administrator, within the constraints of clear criteria, a systematic process and appropriate review, must carry out this function.

Admittedly, the vast majority of teachers are not in the "dismissal" category nor are they yet "masters of the art." It follows, therefore, that staff development activities are a crucial factor in the improvement of the school system. Within this definition, the process of "peer consultation" becomes a viable means of meeting faculty needs. The term "peer consultant" is coined to more accurately reflect what most authors call peer evaluation. The goal of peer consultation is exclusively improvement; the evaluation of colleagues for retention or dismissal, tenure or salary considerations is excluded. Assuming that staff development through peer consultation is the goal, the procedures and circumstances conducive to accomplishing the task become a major concern.

The prerequisite to any change in the educational sector is the creation of an open environment which encourages

experimentation. Inasmuch as educators have a reputation for avoiding risks, it is clear that an administrator who might like to initiate peer consultation faces a formidable task. Compare this activity, which is a fairly sophisticated level of involvement, with the progress made (or not made) in the introduction and institutionalization of participatory management, and one can see that this change is still some years away from general acceptance. Yet, the burden of educational leadership lies with the school principal, and he/she is expected to create the proper atmosphere where educational improvement can take place. Talking to the faculty about the potential benefits of peer consultation will not accomplish this task. Abramson quoted Dr. Carol Schwartz, Director of Curriculum in Tigard, Oregon and advocate of peer evaluation (defined as staff development), as listing two steps that any principal might take to initiate the process. The first is the use of micro-teaching and any number of self-evaluation forms which allow teachers to analyze themselves in action. This activity is expected to stimulate interest and to build the confidence of the faculty in a self-improvement process. The involvement of colleagues in terms of seeking "a second opinion" and suggestions for improvement is the expected result. The second major step involves the principal. Schwartz said the best way to foster openess is <u>to be</u> open. The principal must "put himself on the line" by doing some demonstration teaching and then soliciting evaluation from the faculty.[9] Another, perhaps more

---

[9] P. Abramson, "When Teachers Evaluate Each Other", <u>School Teacher-Junior and Senior High</u>, 10 (1972), 24.

realistic, alternative is to invite criticism and evaluation of his or her performance as an administrator. Whatever the process, the principal's goal is to create an open environment where the exchange of ideas can occur.

Doyle and Olszewski pointed out that the structure of the teaching occupation severely limits the opportunity for colleague interaction and, in fact, forces teachers toward individualism. Further, they suggested that although specific activities or programs may be initiated to encourage colleagial sharing, an on-going program or particular school design (e.g. open space and multi-unit structures) must be implemented to maintain any significant level of interaction.[10] Within this context, it should be obvious that the principal himself or herself must be highly knowledgeable, well-trained and reasonably secure to encourage these activities. In addition, a wise school site administrator will determine the perceptions of superordinates before embarking on the concept of peer consultation.

While an appropriate environment must exist and a program to encourage participation maintained, the school faculty must also have more than a passing interest in self-improvement. Peer consultation will take a commitment of time and energy which is perhaps beyond what should be expected of even the most dedicated teacher. The preparation of the entire faculty for participation, the selection of teachers to act as peer consultants,

---

[10]W. Doyle and R. W. Olszewski, "Colleague Interaction and Teacher Performance," Education, 95 (1975), 276.

and the training of these teachers in observation, analysis, and conference techniques represent a substantial investment in time and effort. Ornstein, discussing changes in social policy, stated: "... ideas need the support of strong public opinion and/or group pressure. Policy changes occur when people or an institution want certain changes badly enough to spend a great deal of effort in getting them ...".[11] Desirable as the concept of peer consultation may be, and given the array of responsibilities which the schools have accepted, do teachers and school administrators want peer consultation badly enough to spend a great deal of effort in getting it?

In addition to the need for an environment which is conducive to change, the free exchange of ideas, creative leadership and faculty commitment, understanding of change theory and the ability to implement a systematic planning process is a condition precedent to success. Developing awareness of needs within the school situation and presenting alternative solutions reflect only two aspect of creative leadership. Further progress in the implementation of the peer consultation concept depends on the skill and care with which goals, objectives, procedures and instruments are developed. Once again, faculty time and effort are required. In this instance, techniques like Delphi could be used, or a steering committee could be selected to prepare the initial plans. Teachers who are especially interested in peer consultation would have the opportunity to contribute. These teachers are

---

[11] A. C. Ornstein, "Evaluating Teachers and School Administrators: The Politics of Accountability," Journal of Research and Development in Education, 8 (1975), 73.

also the ones who would be the first to utilize the process, and who would likely become the best salespersons for the concept. Clearly, to be successful as a staff development process, peer consultation must, at least in the initial stages, be voluntary.

Finally, as a report to the Rockefeller Brothers Fund stated: "all the problems of the schools lead us back sooner or later to one basic problem--financing."[12] The availability of an adequate budget for materials development and duplication, and, more importantly, to free teachers to serve as peer consultants, becomes the pivitol factor. If peer consultation is to become a viable process in the improvement of education, resources adequate to train teachers as peer consultants and to hire substitutes to allow them to spend time in observation and demonstration teaching is crucial. Although educators have often demonstrated an ability to "make-do" with what is available, it is not possible to provide an effective peer consultation program with inadequate funds.

There are several points which should be made in the summary of this discussion. First, the advocates of accountability and those concerned with collective negotiations have focused on a need for change in the evaluation of school personnel. The concept of peer evaluation is offered by members of the educational sector as a substitute for the administrator evaluation which currently exists. Second, it was suggested that the concept of staff development be separated from "evaluation," and that one

---

[12]Rockefeller Brothers Fund, "The Pursuit of Excellence: Education and the Future of America," Panel Report No.V of the Special Studies Project (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958), p. 36.

way to initiate this process was to use a more accurate and descriptive terminology. "Peer consultation" was suggested to represent what most authors in effect, seem to be saying. This term removes the evaluation aspect, and most of the threat, from any exchange between faculty members. Third, assuming that "peer consultation" is an acceptable concept, five elements seem crucial to successful implementation were named. They are: (1) an open environment, (2) creative leadership, (3) commitment of the faculty, (4) planning, and (5) an adequate budget. Fourth, some of the benefits derived from a peer consultation process were implied. Successfully implemented, there are benefits to be realized in terms of staff improvement, and, hopefully, student gain. Other benefits, serendipitous in one sense, include (1) improvement in teacher morale, cooperation and communication, (2) a more open school climate, (3) clearer teacher assignments and expectations and (4) more clearly defined performance standards. Finally, although the concept of peer evaluation is not addressed specifically within this paper, it seems clear that peer consultation will have some impact on the administrator evaluation process. Specifically, the administrator, while retaining responsibility to ascertain the value of or to determine the contribution of an individual to the educational system, whould no longer have complete autonomy in the personnel evaluations he submits to the central office. It is suggested that an environment and a faculty which support peer consultation will have few problems with administrator evaluation.

# A CHANGE MODEL FOR SCHOOLS

Thomas C. Coleman*

"Change in one form or another is an inevitable fact of life and of the world in which we live."[1] We observe change in population, housing, materials, clothing, public and private services, religion, school programs, and in many other components of our society. Historically teachers, parents, and students have had little to do with the changes implemented in schools. These persons apparently believed they had little or no power to affect decisions leading to change or innovation. Change that did occur was mostly by drift, accident, or forced.

The student rebellion during the sixties gave impetus to the notion that change could be accomplished by a form of rebellion conducted by the populace. Forced change took place in school organization and administration, curricular programs, and the employment and retention of teachers. Students and others wanted to be heard and become involved in the decision making process. School personnel did not fully know how to deal with this external input.

The preferred stability and resistance by school staffs to drastic changes was thus overcome during these years of rebellion.

---

*Dr. Coleman is the chairperson of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of the Pacific.

[1]Edgar L. Morphet and others. Educational Organization and Administration (3rd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), p. 180.

> In the past decade American educational policy has been moving away from 25 years of post-World War II emphasis on change and innovation in the schools toward an era that stresses traditional teaching methods. If the past is any guide, this phase will in turn give way eventually to a new national emphasis on educational innovation.[2]

We may be moving into this new period of ambiguity and insecurity with collective bargaining by teachers. Bargaining and teacher strikes are currently causing changes in school policies and administration. Apparently, teacher attitudes towards stability are changing, and the teachers are accepting unrest and disruption. Those teachers who cannot accept conflict and unrest may become frustrated and emotional to the extent their services and attitudes towards their respective positions can be affected negatively. This situation could result in more changes being necessary.

We have learned from observation that change brings disruption and insecurity. Acceptance of change is dependent upon involvement. If persons become threatened, resistance will be present.

> Failure to weigh and evaluate the humanistic elements that relate to the planners and those individuals affected by the plan will lead to serious problems. There must be input of information from many sources and support throughout the organization.[3]

Behaviorists emphasize that change <u>will</u> take place in our heterogeneous society, and there is a need for planned change--not change by drift, accident, or revolution. Planned

---

[2]John Pincus and Richard C. Williams, "Planned Change in Urban School Districts," <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, Vol. 60, No. 10 (June 1979), p. 729.

[3]L. Craig Wilson, <u>School Leadership Today</u> (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), p. 209.

change must involve and consider people -- their knowledge, feelings, and beliefs. Planned change must educate people and cause them to accept the need for change. The problem in schools is how to change teachers and administrators who are accustomed to acting in a given manner.[4]

A change model to be effective must contain systematic and sequential steps involving those persons to be affected by the change. Such a model is described below, and an individual following the steps should be a successful change agent.

Step 1. Create a change atmosphere. The change agent needs to exhibit a democratic leadership style creating an atmosphere must ensure freedom to express new ideas, opportunities for sharing, and time for research. "The administrator or supervisor who cannot even keep the school system operating efficiently at existing levels of performance is not likely to manage change to improved achievements."[5]

Step 2. Conduct needs assessment to identify problems or needed changes. The administrator or change agent may use the Delphi Technique, opinionnaires, brainstorming groups or similar procedures to identify problem areas, needed changes or predict when new changes will be needed. This step must involve many persons, particularly those who will be expected to assume a high

---

[4]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (3rd ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1975), p. 109.

[5]Ibid., p. 109.

degree of compliance. Such persons could include parents, teachers, staff coordinators and supervisors, community organization representatives, school site councils, and students when feasible. Participatory planning allows people to better understand and therefore accept a plan. Non-acceptance is minimized when those people to be affected are involved in the planning or decision.[6]

Step 3. Translate needs into measurable educational objectives. If a change is to be successful, the administrator (change agent) must see that precise educational objectives are developed so it is known what is to be accomplished. The objectives need to be stated in measurable terms so the degree of effectiveness can be identified. The mission statement is developed at this step. "If needed changes are to be effected and have long-range significance in the educational system (or any aspect of the system) it is essential that every proposed change be purposeful--that is, be designed to help achieve some desirable goal or goals."[7] As in Step 2, many diverse persons and groups need to be involved.

Step 4. Identify constraints to proposed change. Most all changes meet with resistance, barriers, or constraints. "It makes no sense to plan organizational change around factors that simply cannot be changed."[8] It is difficult to change peoples'

---

[6]Wilson, p. 221.

[7]Morphet, p. 181.

[8]Gary L. Riley and J. Victor Baldridge, Governing Academic Organizations (Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1977), p. 94.

attitudes, opinions, and beliefs. Organizational structure, technology, and procedures are more readily manipulable. The change agent should examine such constraints as financial, facility, personnel, material, legal, tradition, and philosophical barriers. The locality may also be a constraint as one idea may not be appropriate for a specific school or school district. All needed resources to implement the suggested change must be available.

Step 5. Create interest in new idea or proposed change and obtain support. The change agent should discuss the proposal several times, with many persons, and obtain a commitment from group leaders. Awareness and support is necessary for a change to take place. Influential persons such as faculty leaders and power people must support change efforts. The staff and community must be stimulated to realize that some sort of change is desirable. The new idea should be presented as a suggestion and not as an accomplished fact. Baldridge also pointed out that a staff that is stable (that is, there have been few additions or terminations, or people-changing strategies such as T-groups, sensitivity training, and laboratory groups) should be encouraged to change individuals.[9]

Step 6. Search for alternative solutions for a successful change. At this step the change agent searches for alternative solutions or formulates alternatives from research to achieve the pre-determined objectives. The search and formulation of alternatives can be made possible from empirical

---

[9]Ibid., p. 83.

evidence, research materials and techniques, observations in other school districts, or by an outside consultant. The alternatives generated must be described in detail including the activities or strategies at various stages, the necessary resources, and a time line or event schedule for implementation. Any adverse or negative consequences should also be indentified and the probability for occurring. Suggestions should be developed for lessening or eliminating the negative consequences. This identification may eliminate some alternatives for further consideration.

Step 7. Compare, test, and evaluate alternative solutions. This step is often overlooked or ignored. Testing may require a limited pilot or field test of the alternatives in one grade or subject if no other method of evaluation is possible. This review process should indentify the more appropriate alternative(s) for further consideration and subsequent adoption. "Education would do well to impose the discipline other fields demand on the search for better solutions to plaguing problems. Extravagant and premature claims should not be tolerated."[10] After a thorough evaluation of alternatives, the most feasible one is recommended for pilot testing.

Step 8. Pilot test the selected alternative. The selected alternative is now ready for a pilot or field testing in a grade, subject, or school. It is better to conduct such a test in a limited number of subjects, grades, or schools to determine the degree of success in meeting the predetermined

---

[10]Knezevich, p. 105.

objectives. "A plan or at least portions of it, introduced more gradually, with time to adjust the thinking of the professional individuals involved can be successful. Changes should be made gradually step by step."[11] By a limited field test, the entire district is protected if the alternative needs revision or does not achieve the desired objectives. Process and product evaluation would be integral parts of this step.

Step 9. Evaluation of field tested alternative. Product evaluation is the main activity at this step. The field tested alternative is evaluated in terms of its effectiveness in achieving the pre-determined objectives. Revision or recycling of the alternative really "bombs out," it may be necessary to discard it entirely and search for a new alternative.

Step 10. Adoption and diffusion of alternative. After adoption by the school board, the change agent must develop a diffusion strategy that communicates the alternative to the community and staff, provides workshops to demonstrate how the alternative or new program is to be implemented, assists teachers with utilizing any new materials or procedures, and reduces anxiety by defining responsibilities or clarifying job descriptions. Consultants may be called in to assist with the diffusion strategy. Morphet emphasizes that many excellent plans that have been developed for improving major aspects of education have not resulted in any significant changes because inadequate attention has been given to the development of appropriate policies and procedures

---

[11] Sir James Marks and others, Handbook of Educational Supervision (2nd ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978), p. 124.

for implementation.[12] The staff must be prepared carefully and expertly for that which is to follow.[13]

Step 11. Restore stability and balance. Since change causes ambiguity, insecurity, and instability, the administration needs to give staff members all the assistance as needed. Activities and procedures must be provided that give balance to the school district. Teachers must be made to feel secure in implementing the new alternative program and be provided with the necessary resources to accomplish the program objectives. Job responsibilities and relationships need to be carefully developed. Teachers must be given assistance to control the change. "The ultimate security of people is in their control of change rather than in the absence of change."[14] Leadership related to change lies both in the recognition of the problems of the personnel and in identifying and applying the resources and activities to overcome them.

Step 12. Follow-up evaluation. Teachers, staff persons, and district evaluators need to conduct on-going and follow-up evaluations to determine if the objectives are being met on a long-term basis. Miles emphasized that, "Educational innovations are almost never evaluated on a systematic basis."[15] A case for continuous and follow-up evaluation is made by Pincus when he

---

[12]Morphet, p. 182.

[13]Marks, p. 124.

[14]Wilson, p. 84.

[15]Matthew B. Miles, ed., Innovations in Education (New York: Teachers College, 1964), p. 657.

stated, "A delivery system that does not develop an effective evaluation system may find, when political support declines, that the real need is for hard data illustrating that the innovation has achieved its purposes and should be continued."[16] Follow-up evaluation will also give data to determine if the implemented alternative is in concert with any new trends or necessary changes to meet future demands.

By following an organized change model with its sequential steps, school personnel should be successful in accomplishing a planned change. Knezevich pointed out that change can result from (1) drift (aimless and uncertain activity over a period of time), (2) accident (unplanned and uncertain events), (3) revolution (violent activities), and (4) plans and purposes.[17] School administrators and change agents should strive for planned change with specific objectives.

Success is measured by how well a change is diffused, how well the objectives are attained, and how well the staff is responding. The latter condition will help overcome the major barriers to change, namely staff resistance, frustration, insecurity and anxiety. These are "peopleware" problems that must be given special attention.

Changes should be gradual, if possible, and not abrupt. Change must be thought out carefully and be appealing to those affected. The staff's skills and knowledge should be tapped as

---

[16]Pincus, p. 732.

[17]Knezevich, p. 109.

well as those in the community. A school or district must not run helter-skelter into change. Nor should it change for the sake of change, and it ought to take caution in rejecting any new idea from the staff, as well as implementing any new alternative. Above all, an open environment must be maintained by the administration.